1	
2	
3	
4	
5	CLARK, LINCOLN, AND WHITE PINE counties
6	GROUNDWATER DEVELOPMENT PROJECT
7	DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
8	SCOPING MEETING
9	
10	
11	
12	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
13	
14	On Tuesday, August 16, 2011
15	At 5:00 p.m.
16	
17	At the Lincoln County Alamo Complex
18	121 Joshua Tree Street
19	Alamo, Nevada
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	Reported by: Deborah Ann Hines, CCR #473, RPR

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Thanks, everybody, for coming. I'm John Godec. I've been asked to help facilitate this. This is one of a series of meetings that BLM is doing around and in the basin over a period of three weeks. This is our third week.

1.3

2.2

So let me explain how we've been doing it and then how I think we're going to try to do it tonight because we're in a smaller space than we typically are in. But what we tried to do is use the first part of the meeting as kind of a question-and-answer chance for you to talk with the experts who wrote this document. You see the posters that we've got up.

When you came in, you got a copy of this

Frequently Asked Questions thing which we're calling

kind of an executive summary to the executive

summary. It's an extensive document, as you know,

and the full executive summary of this thing is a

hundred pages long. And, by the way, if you'd like a

copy of it, if you don't have a copy of it, feel free

to grab one on the way out. We've got a few extras.

We also have a newsletter on this project; a written comment form. If you've got something that you'd like to put in writing, please feel free to jot it down, leave it with us tonight or take it home

with you and send it in. If you know folks around town that weren't able to come tonight, and you know they've got comments, please feel free to take some of these along with you and pass it on to them as well.

2.2

That being said, what I think we're going to do is move into the formal public hearing portion of this. And for the formal public hearing part of this, as you notice we have a court reporter here which means that everything that you tell us tonight for the official public record will be included in the environmental impact study when it's complete. If you have specific questions that you ask in this format, those questions will be answered in that document.

What we're going to do, and I think we'll kind of try this, we may turn this into a little bit more of an informal session, but I assume that some of you have specific comments that you would like to make about this. Yes? Do you? Can you give me an idea? Could you raise your hand and give me an idea of how many of you might?

Okay. What we've normally been doing when people come in is asking them to fill out speaker cards. We're a small enough group here I don't think

we need to mess with that. You can stay right where you are. What I'll do here is turn it over to our public hearing officer, Dr. Mike Dwyer, who can explain how this is going to work.

Is that all right, Mike?

DR. MICHAEL DWYER: Sure. All right.

7 Sounds good.

1.3

2.2

Welcome, everyone. Actually kind of nice to have a little smaller crowd and some familiar faces here.

The purpose of this part of the hearing, this formal part of the hearing, is to hear your comments on this document. This is the Clark, Lincoln and White Pine Counties Groundwater

Development Project Draft Environmental Impact

Statement. So this document was prepared by an environmental consulting firm, AECOM. A lot of the folks in with the maps are from AECOM. They developed this under a contract with the Bureau of Land Management and we directed what's in this document.

We created this document in response to an application that we got from the Southern Nevada

Water Authority in 2004 for rights-of-way across public land to construct and operate facilities to

transport groundwater from east Central Nevada to Southern Nevada.

2.2

Let me be clear that at this point no decision has been made by the Bureau of Land Management on that application. The National Environmental Policy Act requires that before we make a decision on that kind of application that we document and consider the impacts that go with that proposed action. This document is the vehicle to do that. So what we'd tried to do here is capture what are the impacts, and this document will go in front of the decision-maker who's required by law to consider those impacts before they make a decision on that right-of-way application.

This hearing is your opportunity really to help us make this as clear, as comprehensive and as accurate as it possibly can be. Seven alternatives are analyzed in this document, six of them are called action alternatives, and they're varying production rates of groundwater and involve different water basins. The seventh alternative is a No Action alternative, which analyzes the impacts if we were to deny this application.

Just a couple of things about what this hearing is not about. This is not about the

allocation of water rights. That is not a decision that the BLM makes, that is a decision in the hands of the state government, the State of Nevada, and specifically the Nevada State Engineer. The state engineer has received a separate application from the water authority for water rights associated with this project. And the state engineer will conduct hearings on that application starting next month for a couple of months before he makes that decision.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Second, we really have not been running these meetings like debates. We're not here to defend what's in this document, this is a draft document. So what we want to do is hear what you think about this, hear how we can make it better. So this is our time in this meeting to listen to what you have to say. So if you ask a question during this, and we can be a little more informal here, but we haven't been answering a lot of questions in this back and forth kind of environment, but we have a bunch of experts in the room, hydrology people, geology, biology, socioeconomic, so if you think of a question while we're taking testimony from folks, please feel free to stand up, walk in the meeting over here, find somebody with a name tag and get your question answered.

As John said we want to hear from everybody that has something to say. I don't think that will be an issue tonight but we've been limiting folks to five minutes, so maybe we'll use that as a starting place, and I think we have plenty of time.

2.2

Written comments, by the way, carry just as much weight as if you were to stand up and make a public comment tonight. If you don't feel like standing up and doing so, please give us comments in writing. And we've extended the comment period to October 11th of 2011 to submit written comments.

Regarding audience participation, please treat the speaker as you would like to be treated when it's your turn up here. Please don't interrupt the speaker, and please know that audience reactions or comments will not be part of the transcript.

Finally let me explain what happens from this point forward and then I'll sit down and give you the floor. The comments that you make here tonight, along with all of those that we collect at the public meetings and all those comments that we get in writing, will be used to develop the final version of this document.

The final version will include a comment response document that actually shows what we've done

with every comment we've received, how it's been used. When the final version of this is ready for release, we'll publish a notice in the Federal Register, as well as in the local newspaper, and we'll post it on our BLM website. We'll post a notice of availability of the final document. A decision on the right-of-way application can be made any time after 30 days, 30 days after that notice of availability is published. And when a decision is finally made, a record of decision will be published in the Federal Register, in newspapers and posted on the web.

2.2

So finally I'd just like to extend my thanks to everybody for being here. I've worked on a lot of environmental impact statements in my 31 years with the BLM, I work for the Ely District Office of the BLM, and they're always better for vigorous public review and comment, so thank you for being here.

And with that, John, I'll turn it over to our facilitator and we'll open the floor to folks that would like to speak.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: How about if we just kind of make it a little bit easier, why don't we start from the back and kind of work our way forward, is that all right? Anybody in the back row

C

```
1
     have something in particular?
 2
               Second row?
 3
               DR. MICHAEL DWYER: One last thing, John,
 4
     just for those folks that came in late, when you
     stand up and make a public comment, everything that
 5
 6
     you say will be recorded by our court reporter here
 7
     verbatim, so it will become part of the public
 8
     record.
              Thanks.
 9
               FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: What I'll do is ask
10
     you to please state your name, spell your name and
11
     give us your home address, or your mailing address
12
     actually. All right? So who has something to say?
1.3
     Who would like to start?
14
               ED HIGBEE: I'll start because I know after
15
     I do there's going to be many of you guys that want
16
     to take part. I just want to thank the BLM for being
17
     here and going through this.
18
               FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Can you give us
19
     your name and address.
20
               ED HIGBEE: Ed Higbee, E-d, H-i-q-b-e-e,
21
     junior.
2.2
               FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: And your mailing
23
     address?
24
               ED HIGBEE: P.O. Box 242, Alamo, Nevada
25
     89001.
```

The first question I would like answered, and I know probably some of this stuff is addressed, let me confess I've not totally read all this EIS stuff, but these are some of the questions that I have, and I know some of the other people that I've talked to have the same questions.

2.2

Number one, is this needed? Is this pipeline up through here, is it needed to come up and try to suck some of these valleys, and we think it will suck them dry in time, to take them down and put them into Las Vegas? I don't know it's needed, for one thing.

And another question I have is there going to be a trigger mechanism to where out in these aquifers, when they do pull down to a certain level, are we going to shut down a billion dollar pipeline? And that's a question to me that the only way you can deal with that is have money already set and a bond in place to where if it does go below that certain point, then the money goes to the counties to pay for it. I don't know, because they're not going to shut it down. Does anybody believe they'll shut it down until there's nothing else to suck? I wouldn't think so. I'm glad you think that.

And then we'll have all -- if the time comes

they do put this pipeline in, there's going to be all kinds of mitigation that are going to come right across. Of course they'll travel right through the white sage flat, I would bet, because that makes — that's the easiest place to go. It's downhill. And it will flat destroy these things. It will destroy some of the plants and different things that we have out in these valleys. It will never been the same.

2.2

But I know it will never be the same. You can't make any of these roads back to where they ever was originally. It's not going to happen. So we need to be very careful on that, where this thing goes. I would like to have some input of local people, where some of these -- even this transmission line we're dealing with. If we could have a little more help where that goes would be helpful to us.

And some of these hydrologists out here in the other room, where does this water come from? I know it doesn't rain enough around here to make these aquifers full of water, so do we know where it comes from? So I think that needs to be answered. I would like this to be stalled until we know where this water comes from. And if there's any chance that the aquifer can be recharged, maybe it can, I don't know. Does anybody? Nobody is raising their hand. This

isn't a give and take, it's my comments.

2.2

And if this could be done scientifically, I would like it to be done scientifically and not politically. We know that if Clark County, they have the votes to do about anything they basically want to in the state of Nevada. So if we can do this scientifically, and if it can be proved it will never pull these aquifers down and cause desertification to us up in the lands then I guess I can go with it. I don't mind people, you know, having progress in this life. But if it's going to pull these aquifers down and it's going to make us all a worse desert than we already are and change what we are and who we are, then I'm going to have to oppose it. So thanks.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: I think this gentleman over here actually had his hand up first. Did you want to go next?

ED UEHLING: Before I make any comment, I'd like to ask a question.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: At this particular point we'd like to do this as a public hearing, if you've got something.

ED UEHLING: Would it be possible to -- they gave no information. What is this process for the BLM in the whole process? What is the beginning?

What's the end? From talking to these people outside, they're saying that this is already been predetermined, that Congress has declared this pipeline is legal to be built through the BLM land, so are we just wasting our time here? Is that true? What's the process?

2.2

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: The answer is, the bottom line is this is not a waste of time, but the document that you have before you is the study that's been going on for the past six years that looks at the consequences of a request that's been made by the Southern Nevada Water Authority.

And as Mike mentioned before, this is a draft. This is the basic information that's been presented. This is your opportunity to comment on that information and add to it as you see fit, or if you have additional questions, they can be asked in the context here and they will be answered in the final document format.

ED UEHLING: Where is it in the scheme, the whole scheme, this whole project from beginning to having to the thing built and water running?

 $\hbox{FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC:} \quad \hbox{If you look at the} \\ \hbox{executive summary, the timeframe on this goes out } --$

ED UEHLING: I'm not talking about the

14

```
timeframe, I'm talking about actions.
 1
                                             Who has
 2
     authority? Where does it start? Where does it end?
 3
               FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: That's a pretty
 4
     broad --
 5
               ED UEHLING: Where is the BLM in this
 6
     process?
 7
               FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: BLM is responsible
 8
     for the land on which the pipeline would be located.
 9
     You're asking a very broad question, and this isn't
10
     the time for the debate. I'll do my best to answer
11
     the basics, but if you look at the Q and A we
12
     prepared, I think it answers most of what you just
1.3
     asked.
14
               Ma'am, did you have a comment that you
15
     wanted to make?
16
               LYNDA YOUNCE: Yes, I do.
17
               FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Would you mind
18
     giving us your name and spelling it.
19
               LYNDA YOUNCE: My name is Lynda Younce,
20
     Y-o-u-n-c-e. And it's L-y-n-d-a. P.O. Box 416,
21
     Alamo, Nevada.
2.2
               I've been a resident in Alamo for the last
23
     ten years. And I knew early on about this project
24
     partly because I have family in construction and
25
     involved in some of this stuff, and I've had concerns
```

15

1 the whole way. Do we have an oversight committee for 2 this or is it already established or is there going 3 to be an oversight committee established that 4 communicates directly with the locals on some of their concerns ongoing, not just now? I mean, it's 5 6 clear that Clark County has got some desperate needs 7 but we have had these concerns for quite some time 8 and really no place to voice them, other than midair, 9 because we're finally getting to the part where here 10 we are. We've all known about it. There's been 11 12 major concerns in the community, and we need 1.3 someplace that doesn't take this another year or two 14 to find out what kind of contingency plans may be 15 established in this community and every other 16 community that may be impacted by this. FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Anyone else? 17

Yes, sir?

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

PHIL ANDERSON: My name is Phil Anderson, My address is Post Office Box 172, Alamo, has been for almost a year and a half. Prior to that I lived in Las Vegas, Nevada.

And I have several concerns about this. I've seen several projects similar to this turn sour on the people that lost their water. And I won't

live long enough that it will have a big effect on me, but I think on the young people living in this area and those who come here future time, there will be an effect.

2.2

grow, they can bring in more people and sell them a connection to their water company for an exorbitant amount of money and collect water dues for those people and make a big profit on them. These are people who own the water company who want to make the big profits. I think we need to look where the money is going for this project.

Right now Las Vegas water rates are about one quarter of what we pay for the same amount of water here in Alamo. Why have they got a big water problem down there and we don't have an even bigger one? We need the water as much as they do.

Sure, we're not supposed to grow, right?

We're supposed to stay stagnant or actually become a ghost town so that they can have the water that's here. Where did the water come from? I'll tell you where it came from, it's been accumulating in these valleys for thousands of years. The water table that's here has not built up over the last couple of years or ten years or a hundred years, but it's been

building up over thousands of years.

2.2

I asked the question earlier will the water table be affected by drawing down huge amounts of water that they want to draw down, and he showed me charts. And, yes, it will. The water table will go down. What does that mean to you? That means that if your water comes from a well, it's going to cost more to pump it, you're going to have to go deeper to get it, and eventually it may be so deep that it's not even worthwhile doing it so let's get out. No way we can get water anymore.

Folks, your water is important to you. You need to keep it. But we need to ask ourselves some other questions. It was asked what does the BLM have to do with it. Yes, they have to do with the land. So are we going to destroy the land? Well, let me ask a question there. Was there a threshold put on if we make this study and it goes beyond the threshold, we do not do the project or will it just be approved anyhow? Who makes that decision? Who makes it for the BLM? Is it somebody that's going to be affected by it? I don't think so. I don't think they're going to be affected at all by it.

Who makes the decision as to whether to give out the permits for the water? It's somebody in

Carson City, and we should know who it is so that we can get rid of them and get them dis-elected if they don't do what we, as a people, are going to benefit from.

2.2

You've never seen one of these projects be reversed or turned off. It never will be. And if you lose your water for these people, they'll suck it dry and they don't care because they'll be making their big bucks. And look at who some of the people who benefit. I think you'll find some of our leaders in our government will be benefitted by it, them and their families and so forth. I think you need to look where the money is going to be flowing before this decision is made.

Let me ask you a question. You know, it's important that we know who makes these decisions but is there criteria establish for these decisions?

DR. MICHAEL DWYER: Well, yeah. You know, the National Environmental Policy Act is the law that says whoever this decision maker is, and it starts with the Secretary of the Interior and can be delegated downward through the Bureau of Land Management.

PHIL ANDERSON: Can we trust their judgment?

DR. MICHAEL DWYER: They must take into

consideration the impacts that are documented in this document.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

PHIL ANDERSON: Who's familiar with the desert tortoise? You know what they did, they spent a lot of money and they studied whether the desert tortoise was going to be able to survive while these subdivisions were being made and they found out that, well, we have to charge everybody that's going to do a subdivision some money to study the impact. Now what did they do with the tortoises? They went out and charged people money to gather up the tortoises and put them in a tortoise place and then that wasn't a good place for them so what did they do with them, they killed them. They killed the tortoises. are they going to do with you? You're kind of like a tortoise. You're not important. If you don't like it, we're going to do it anyhow. And if it's not good for you, we'll get rid of you somehow.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Phil, can you wrap up a little bit. We're trying to keep this to five minutes.

PHIL ANDERSON: I can wrap it up very easily. I think we ought to fight tooth and nail to not let them take this water, because those aquifers that have been there for thousands of years are not

replaceable. The amount of water we get in this

Great Basin will not replace them in thousands of

years to come. And every time we draw down below the

level that's usable for us, we're in trouble. And

they'll never allow it to build back up because they

won't allow it to build back up long enough.

1.3

2.2

DR. MICHAEL DWYER: Thank you.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Yes, sir?

JOHN SANDERS: I'm John Sanders, J-o-h-n, S-a-n-d-e-r-s. My address is HC 61 Box 15, Hiko, Nevada 89017.

I run a ranching operation in Lincoln County and in White Pine County. Both ends of the property will be greatly impacted by this potential project.

I realize that BLM does not have any authority over the state water law and issues but I think there's a couple of important points I would like to bring up.

On this one handout that you gave us, it talks about the SNWA proposed project to develop more than 176,000 acre feet per year for five different basins. At this point I am aware of only one basin that they've even began the process of determining how much water yield there is and how many they can take. Delamar Valley and Dry Lake Valley, which concern the operation that I'm on on the south end,

I'm aware of no applications or any production wells being proposed.

1.3

2.2

There were a number of monitoring wells that went into the ground. They told us they were monitoring wells. They broke state water regulations. Monitoring well is no more than a three-inch casing. These wells were drilled with 21-inch casings. We asked them if they were production wells and they assured us, oh, no, no, they're not production wells.

This comment that you have right here saying 176,000 acre feet out of five basins shows that they have intentions of pumping. So my question becomes to the BLM is how is it possible to develop an environmental impact statement when we don't even know where they're targeting to pump in these other valleys? We can approve it and then they we can drill more wells or whatever they need to do and it wasn't involved in the study.

So I think there's some very important issues that they need to identify exactly where these production, this, you know, groundwater mining activity is going to go on, and that needs to be included before this EIS can even be complete. Can't make any decisions on it.

The other end of the ranch is in Spring Valley, North Spring Valley. We're completely surrounded by production wells on this project that will be filling the pipelines.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

You talked a little bit on page five about the mathematical computer monitoring. I'm wondering exactly how familiar the BLM staff is on this water model that they've produced. I don't know if you realize that there's a thousand kilometer area, thousand square kilometer area per square on the That means that they can make some general, very general observations and predictions of what might happen, but that one spring that produces a gallon a minute that my ranch depends on, that is so valuable that we might have 20 or 30 or 40 miles of buried pipeline to maintain to carry that water and distribute it around the range, that one spring that produces one gallon a minute may not even show up on their modeling. And if it does, will it be affected, yes or no plus or minus 50 feet drawdown?

You know, they can say, oh, no, it won't be affected, it will only be 48 feet drawdown but that spring might be adversely affected in 12 feet drawdown. We don't know. And so those critical water sources have not been identified in the study.

The mathematical model is not sufficient to make any determination on those. And I think the BLM needs to be looking at the specifics of that water modeling.

2.2

That will be addressed I'm sure in Carson

City, but BLM also needs to be looking at that,

because when the springs start drying up on the

hillside, it's going to affect everything, not just

our cattle operation but all the wildlife and

recreation and vegetation and everything.

I have a question about mitigation. You know, we talk about mitigation. You know, a lot of times, well, if you're going to put a gate, well, we'd really rather have a cattle guard than a gate because cattle guards are designed to be left open, right? Makes a lot of sense. But when we're talking about this spring, what's our mitigation? Is BLM going to approve me to spend a hundred thousand dollars to drill a well to pump water for my cattle to replace what the spring has lost?

You know, the state water engineer may require them to help pay the bill, but does that not exacerbate the problem? If the springs are going dry, we don't need to drill another well, you know. So looks like to me like the only mitigation that we have is one that continues to complicate, you know,

the problems that might arise from this.

1.3

2.2

Mr. Highee talked a little bit about -Mr. Highee talked a little bit about these white sage
flats. From a nutritional standpoint this is the
critical backbone of these ranching operations.
These white sage flats are high in protein, they're
highly palatable. The ability of that plant to
maintain its production level year in and year out
through the drought is important to our ranching
operations, as well a how well it sustains its
nutritive value. You know, it can sit there for
three years with no rain and when you turn it on it
still has some feed value as opposed to a lot of the
other forages that dry up and turn to straw and are
depleted over time.

All you have to do is drive during hunting season, have somebody drive across the flat and three more cars drive after it and you have a permanent road. This white sage will not come back. We can go to places that had fires a hundred years ago and there's still no white sage. I don't know what causes the germination and the establishment of the seedlings, but those factors are not present in our environment today. If it's rain, if it's temperature or whatever, white sage does not germinate, it does

not establish and will be lost forever.

2.2

I guess we have to decide are golf courses in Vegas more important than white sage flats. For me and my operation and my personal belief, we need to be maintaining this and I think that's what the BLM has been charged with is maintaining the value, the intrinsic value of these ranges up here. Thank you.

DR. MICHAEL DWYER: Thanks.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Anybody else?

ED UEHLING: My name is Ed Uehling, E-d,
U-e-h-l-i-n-g. I live in Las Vegas. I was referred
to -- you referred me to this statement that starts
off, What is this project all about. And you found
it necessary to repeat the propaganda that the
Southern Nevada Water District, water authority, is
giving out, the Las Vegas Valley Water District is
giving out.

You say, Historically Southern Nevada has relied primarily on the Colorado River to meet its water needs. That's normal. New Orleans relies on the Mississippi River. They're not constructing a pipeline to Oklahoma to bring water to New Orleans. Chicago relies on Lake Michigan. Las Vegas relies on the Colorado River. Yes, it's the only city on the

entire Colorado River in the entire Colorado -- large city on the entire Colorado River system. So there's nothing wrong with that.

1.3

2.2

And then you say, Reductions in flow over recent years, I'll go into the -- let me just finish the sentence, complicated river water rights allocations, ongoing drought, and past growth in both population and businesses in the southwestern U.S. threaten to overuse available Colorado River water.

Reductions in flow and this ongoing drought are the two basic -- it's the same thing. It's the basic lie that's being told. There is 14 million -- there are 14 million acre feet of water in the Colorado River system. The upper states use about seven million and the lower states use the other seven million that's left. There's a drought, yes. In the Southwest there's always periods of drought, but there is no serious drought on the Colorado River.

And plus we have a lake that holds 25 million acre feet of water to put us through these periods when there possibly might be a drought. The river carries -- there's at least six million acre feet of water to get down to Lake Mead, and usually it's around seven or eight million acre feet of

water. And so there is no shortage of water. Las

Vegas only uses 300,000 acre feet, draws 300,000 acre

feet of water out of the lake. That's the allocation

for the State of Nevada. And right now I think we're

using like 200 or 220,000 acre feet per year. So

they don't even -- the use for Nevada is way below

what's needed.

2.2

But there's a big difference between seven million acre feet and 300,000. And so where does the rest of this water go? It goes down primarily to the farms and where it's wasted, where a lot of it is wasted with antiquated irrigation processes in the Imperial Valley and in Arizona and other valleys in Southern California.

So the notion of drought is totally false. They've drawn down -- it's just bad resource allocation. They've drawn down this 25 million acre foot lake down to where it's about 10 or 11 million is all that's left in the lake now.

Now because of the huge snow this year, yes, it's coming up, and there will be other huge snows.

There's basically because of global warming, or whatever you want to call it, there's 25 percent more water in the rivers of the world than there was before the -- then there has been in the past, which

is natural. As the oceans heat up, they will have more evaporations, more evaporation and there will be more fresh water on the land. So it's a total lie.

2.2

Complicated river water rights allocation.

That's the main issue. Complicated river water rights. These are created by the federal government.

These are immutable rules that the federal government says can't be changed, and there resides the problem.

Las Vegas offered to go down and pave the -cement the irrigation ditches going into these farms
because they weren't before, and 300,000 acre feet of
water was being lost in the irrigation ditches, which
is the same amount of water that Las Vegas says it
needs now. Well, so that could have doubled the
water supply and it would have cost almost nothing,
much cheaper than this project.

Well, what happened? The complicated federal water river rights rules prohibit that. You cannot make a change of water between two states in that way. So this is not rocket science, this is all politics and incompetence and, etc.

Okay, past growth of both population and businesses threaten to overuse the water. That's just not true. There's plenty of water, it just has to be allocated differently in the river, or from the

river I should say. And with that this pipeline is just totally unnecessary.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Let's discuss the economic aspects of it with the water authority. I pay for most of the water I use, I pay \$4 per thousand gallons. That's about \$1300 per acre foot of water in Las Vegas. And even with that charge of water, this agency is so incompetent that it has borrowed \$5 billion to do projects, who knows what. It only has to transport the water 20 miles, and it still can't finance itself. It has to take from its reserves. It has to increase its rate. It increased the rates last year and the year previous, \$18 million each year. Southern Nevada Water Authority just raised their rates two weeks ago or four weeks ago. This whole project is to cover up the incompetence. imagine --

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Mr. Uehling, can you please wrap up.

ED UEHLING: Okay. Just imagine if it costs all the money that they make and charging \$4 per thousand gallons to transport water 20 miles, how much is it going to cost to transport water 300 miles? Twenty times as much? \$80 per thousand gallons? That's like \$10,000 per acre foot. That's

30

```
1
     what this agency -- that's what this agency is so
 2
     incompetent, that's what they'll do.
                                           And, sir,
 3
     there's no profits with this agency. Yes, Patricia
 4
     Mulroy make $350,000 a year but there are no profits.
 5
     There's all losses, incredible bureaucracy, just full
     of lies.
 6
 7
               FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Anyone else?
 8
               Yes, sir?
 9
               BEVAN LISTER: Bevan Lister, B-e-v-a-n,
10
     L-i-s-t-e-r. P.O. Box 124 in Pioche, 89043.
11
               This is in addition to my comment that I
12
     made in Pioche and supplemental to my written
1.3
     comments. I'd like to make three points here
14
     tonight. One I made somewhat in Pioche but for the
15
     benefit of these folks so that you know and
16
     understand, I think the EIS should say right on the
17
     front page, introductory, This is the cost of the
18
     environmental impact statement process, the NEPA
19
     process, and it's all moot.
                                  This has already been
```

approved by Harry Reid in the Lincoln County

Conservation Recreation Development Act, and all of
this money is spent for not. And I think that needs
to be on the front page. I think that's right in
front so that everybody knows it, not just us but
anybody that picks the document up.

Secondly, and this is kind of what drove me down here tonight, I'm very offended by your BLM ranger armed and present at these proceedings. It is offensive. It is intimidating and coercive and I formally protest the entire hearing process that has had an armed ranger present. He has no more authority here than I do. He acts under no color of any kind of legal backing. He has no jurisdiction, and it is a personal affront to me and an insult to the people here that you have to have an armed mall cop at the Denny's across the street trying to enforce whatever he's doing.

2.2

I would ask, and I think it should be included, that any hearing that had a BLM ranger at it should be re-held with local law enforcement. If you need security, have your local law enforcement take care of it, but he does not belong. That is totally and completely inappropriate.

It was my intention to show up here armed tonight. Because Nevada is an open carry state, I fully respect his right to carry a firearm in an open manner, as long as I get the same privilege. Now in the school in Pioche, that's a different story. He violated the law and we'll see yet whether the D.A. will take him to court over it or not.

1 Third point, what is the socioeconomic 2 impact of a ghost town? Is that included in your 3 economic analysis of what this project encompasses 4 and what it will do? How do you count the loss in real estate value? How do you count the loss in 5 6 infrastructure and jobs? How do you count the lost 7 opportunities? 8 You know, it's really kind of strange, in 9 the early days the federal government had policies 10 and laws in place to dispose of land, put people out 11 there so that they can manage it and so that there 12 would be an effective, safe infrastructure throughout 13 the country. Now we're talking about removing 14 people. We're talking about a project that will in 15 effect demolish whatever communities there are here, 16 because water is the lifeblood in the west. 17 cannot exist without it. Good enough. 18 FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Anybody else? 19 Yes, sir? 20 JERRY JOHNSTON: I got here late so I didn't 21 see all these documents. 2.2 FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Could you give us 23 your name and your address please? 24 JERRY JOHNSTON: Jerry Johnston, Alamo, 25 Nevada. J-o-h-n-s-t-o-n. My personal experience, I

grew up in Yerington and we had a drought up there and all the farmers that had hay and onions and potatoes went into a fast mode drilling wells to protect their crops after the second or third year.

2.2

I had a neighbor, well, two neighbors, one had a dairy and he had his well on one corner section of his property, and another neighbor drilled a well up about a quarter of a mile from him. And as soon as within two or three days of him starting to pump that big well, pumping five or six acre feet of water to irrigate his alfalfa field, he dried the dairyman's well up and he had to go in and punch another hole down to the depth that they had drilled the big well just to get water back to that dairy.

I've got two or three little pieces of range out here that got real small springs on them, same as John Sanders was saying. Minimum amount of water that runs and runs. If they put these wells in and they drop that water table 10, 12 feet, is that going to dry up all my springs? Part of them is in rough country. The cows ain't -- one good spring there, a little sheep on the other side of the mountain, cows ain't going to go over the mountain to get that other water.

So is Las Vegas going to take and reimburse

34

```
1
     us or put in some kind of a -- something in there
 2
     that they're going to supply water for our cattle in
 3
     these places where they're inaccessible? I can't
 4
     haul water to them. I've got one well out here, I
     pump the water 720 feet. If they drop ten feet, that
 5
 6
     well may be dry. Who's going to pay me for hauling
 7
     all the water out to my cows? I think that needs to
 8
     be included in the information, that they need to
 9
     supply the water for our livestock operations.
10
     That's all I've got to say.
               BEVAN LISTER: They'll only charge you
11
12
     25,000 for a connection fee.
1.3
               FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Anybody else?
14
     Please take the opportunity.
15
               PHIL ANDERSON: Can I just ask two questions
16
     more?
17
               FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Let this lady go
18
     first and you will.
19
               Go ahead.
20
               LAURELLE HUGHES: I'm Laurelle,
21
     L-a-u-r-e-l-l-e, Hughes, H-u-g-h-e-s. P.O. Box 263,
2.2
     Alamo, Nevada 89001.
23
               And my question or my comment, the process,
24
     I'm wondering about the -- I'm hearing on the radio
25
     that now -- or on TV that southwestern Utah, I'm a
```

35

```
1
     Utah person, I'm looking at Penny and thinking Utah.
 2
     The proponent.
 3
               DR. MICHAEL DWYER:
                                   Water authority.
 4
               LAURELLE HUGHES: Water authority is saying
 5
     well, maybe we won't really need it but we want to
     proceed with it as if we did.
 6
                                    And how long is the
 7
     information from the EIS good?
                                     How long would we be
 8
     sitting and wondering how long, if the water
 9
     authority will come in 15, 20 years from now and
10
     activate their application when they don't need it
11
     now. What is the timeframe that we're looking at for
12
     permits, rights-of-way and that type of thing being
     issued?
1.3
14
               FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Anybody else,
15
     something specific for the public record?
16
               BEVAN LISTER: How long is the data good
          What's the life of this EIS?
17
     for?
18
               LAURELLE HUGHES: That's part and parcel
19
     really of...
20
               FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Anybody else,
21
     anything else specifically at this point?
2.2
               LAURELLE HUGHES: I would like to make that
23
     part of my...
24
               FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: That's fine.
                                                       Ιt
25
                  Do you have a couple other questions
     is.
          It is.
```

you'd like on the record?

2.2

PHIL ANDERSON: I just have a question. And the two questions are this: Las Vegas wants the water so they can grow. What gives them the better chance to take the water so they can grow than we can survive? Have they got more rights than we have?

Are we not important?

The next question is somebody was paid to do this piece of work, and supposedly they were working to get things accurate, and yet I look at this map on the very front, and Moapa, part of Lincoln County, Caliente seem to be on the Utah side of that line that's right at the top of that picture. If they have that kind of accuracy in what they do, how can we trust that what's in here is even accurate?

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Anybody else that hasn't spoken yet?

Yes, sir?

ED UEHLING: This project reaches such a level of insanity that one has to ask what is really behind this. And I'm sure some of the people know answers to that but I would ask some questions about that. One can only conclude that there are political reasons behind this.

And I've heard that Senator Reid, that the

development that's going to benefit the most is

Coyote Springs, and that Senator Reid is, I think

it's a fact that he's very good friends with Harvey

Whittemore, the owner of Coyote Springs. And several

of his sons work in the same law firm as Harvey

Whittemore, and I'm wondering does anyone here know

that there's a real connection there and that that's

really the reason. Is it true that the L.A. Times

article that said he had the power line, apparently

there's some power line that was built somewhere in

this area, was switched away from that project? Is

that true?

2.2

I mean, are there underhanded, under table deals going on where people on the inside are buying property at a cheap price and then selling it to the water district for a high price? Has the BLM been influenced by Senator Reid? Is that how we're in this position today because he has passed something through the Congress to support this? What is his real motivation in doing that?

I would like answers to those questions.

Because this can only be explained, this insanity can only be explained by someone making a lot of money somewhere or gaining a lot of power. I'm sure the BLM has some answers.

1 FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Anybody else? 2 Mike, would you like to suspend the formal 3 public hearing at this point? 4 DR. MICHAEL DWYER: Anybody else like to speak? All the specialists will stick around here 5 6 with the maps and so on. You're welcome to stay and 7 visit with those folks. 8 ED UEHLING: You represent the BLM of 9 Nevada, right? 10 DR. MICHAEL DWYER: Correct. 11 ED UEHLING: I happened to be in Salt Lake a 12 few days ago and met with a BLM person up there, and 1.3 if there's a BLM in Utah, and the BLM in Utah, do 14 they have a different point of view or are they not 15 permitted to have a different point of view? 16 those things happening? I know there's a lot of concern there's 17 18 going to be dust storms and other things in Utah. 19 That's a heavily populated area. The wind stream, 20 the wind, I don't know what you call it, the wind 21 currents from this area over to Utah, there are a lot 2.2 of people in the path. The reason why, Owens Valley 23 or Death Valley is in the path of the dust storms. FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: 24 Tell you what, if 25 it's okay with you, I don't think it's appropriate

necessarily for Dr. Dwyer to be answering questions, he's here to serve as the public hearing officer, to make sure that your concerns, your comments are heard. But I'm going to ask Penny Woods, who's the project manager for this, for BLM, to try to answer a couple of questions, if you don't mind.

Is that all right?

2.2

PENNY WOODS: Sure. I don't know if you're all interested in hearing these answers, you know, because we can move to the other room and meet with you individually, but I'd be happy to address your concern about BLM in Utah being involved in this project.

UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN: I'd like to hear what you have to say.

PENNY WOODS: Sure. Sure. And so we have been working closely with BLM in Utah, and any decision that our state director makes, she will make in concert with the state director in Utah.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Let me try to clarify a couple of things here. First of all, I'm just the facilitator, so you can largely ignore me.

I was asked by BLM to make sure that you got answers to your questions as best as we can make that happen, make sure that this process works.

The only way that I can facilitate anything is if you give me permission to do that. If you've got questions, specific questions you'd like to ask of these experts, feel free to wander up, talk with them, we can address a lot of this.

2.2

In the comments that everybody just made I heard probably at least 50 or 60 questions in there. This is an exceedingly complex issue. This is really difficult. Most of the questions that you raised are contained in this or the larger environmental impact study, which is 4,000 pages. I don't think anybody wants to stick around here for three days while these guys attempt to give you answers verbally to all of that information, but we can try to provide some of the answers simply if you would like. Would you prefer to do it that way?

LYNDA YOUNCE: I want to know if that's available to the public online, that document.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Absolutely. Yes, ma'am. It's available online. The website is contained in both of these documents. The executive summary of it is here that probably answers most of what was raised. And please feel free to grab one of these on your way out, if you'd like to.

I know that most of you haven't had a chance

```
1
     to read through it. It's a very technical document.
 2
     We've tried to translate it as best we can in this to
 3
     simplify it. It's a lot of technical data, a lot of
 4
     hydrology. And we can give you the full copy, which
 5
     is 4,000 pages, but it's also available online and
 6
     that is a public document.
 7
               BEVAN LISTER: In the back of the executive
 8
     summary are the CDs that have --
 9
               FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Absolutely. Right.
10
     So you can pull it up there.
11
               ED UEHLING: I know we citizens are very
12
     stupid compared to you government bigwigs, but why
1.3
     can't we have the answers to the 50 or 60 questions
14
     that have been asked?
15
               DR. MICHAEL DWYER: Let's adjourn the
16
     meeting and you're welcome to go in and --
17
               ED UEHLING: No, why do we have to ask
18
     individually? Why can't you answer the questions?
19
               DR. MICHAEL DWYER: Because this part of the
20
     session is to take your comments on this document.
21
               ED UEHLING: I know it's very complicated
2.2
     for us stupid people.
23
               FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: We can try to take
24
     these one at a time, but keep in mind we've got 50 or
     60 --
25
```

ED UEHLING: Right. You haven't answered a single one. Try to answer some of the questions.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Where would you like to start?

2.2

ED UEHLING: You've answered one. She answered one question.

LYNDA YOUNCE: I will be really honest with you, I am extremely distrusting of my government. I have seen abuses, you have seen abuses. We have seen abuses all the way from the top all the way down to our local police departments. We see abuses every day. I'm sick and tired of being screwed by my government.

I want a project that has to happen, not because somebody along the way palms are getting greased or somebody is going to make money off of it, but us little people are going to get the shaft, as we do frequently from our government as of the last 75 years. I'm sick and tired of it.

I have become an extremely hostile individual, and I can assure you that I am just one of many. I'm tired of it. We've got questions. It seems to me that, yes, there's a lot of paperwork and that's part of the problem. It's so complex that we never really know the truth. And I'm sick of that

too. Because every single project that gets started, whether it's at a federal level or a state level, we have these kind of complexities, and I want every, God damn it I hate to say it, but I want everybody's name, I want to know who they are, I want to know what their affiliation is. Because, you know what, I don't trust anyone anymore.

2.2

And I'm being honest. I'm letting you all know. I go to bed every night wondering who in the hell is running this thing. We ain't got enough money to feed our families let alone start a project like this. Who is running this? And I'm sorry if that offends you, because I'm sure that you all have high integrity with the project that you're doing, but we, the people out here, we're getting a little fed up.

And I just really want every question answered and I want to hear them all. Because I've been seeing it going on in a lot of different phases. Connecting the dots, I'm doing it every day in my sleep and I don't like what I see.

PENNY WOODS: Something that I think we need to talk about is that a lot of the questions that you've asked are good questions, but we may not know the answers right now, right this minute, and that's

```
1
     why we wanted to get on the record to go back and
 2
     consider it when we write the final, we need to have
 3
     considered answers.
 4
               LYNDA YOUNCE: It says on here something
     about an extension period for...
 5
               PENNY WOODS:
                             The comments?
 6
 7
               LYNDA YOUNCE: Yes.
 8
               PENNY WOODS: You can have until
 9
     October 11th.
               LYNDA YOUNCE: And what if we need more time
10
11
                 This is a very large document. There's a
     than that?
12
     lot of questions. That is not enough time.
1.3
               PENNY WOODS: I realize that. I sympathize.
14
               LYNDA YOUNCE: Okay. That doesn't help me.
15
               PENNY WOODS:
                             That's as much as I could --
16
               LYNDA YOUNCE: This is our land. You're
17
     supposed to be, in my estimation, working for us and
18
     yet I hear that we have a deadline that is not
19
     sufficient for we, the people, to examine this issue
20
     thoroughly. Now where do you see that is freedom of
21
     choice?
2.2
               BEVAN LISTER: In your comments, anyone, in
23
     your comments, especially if you submit written
24
     comments, state that there is simply not enough time.
25
               LYNDA YOUNCE: I need another comment sheet.
```

```
1 I filled one out. Give me two please.
```

2 BEVAN LISTER: Tell them you need an

3 extension until 2019 or whatever.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

4 LYNDA YOUNCE: Because I don't feel it's 5 fair to the people.

BEVAN LISTER: We need more time. That's a valid comment.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: We have heard that before. Keep in mind that the environmental impact process is designed for one particular purpose:

Somebody comes up with an idea and says, We want to do something like move groundwater from the Great Basin to Las Vegas, they have to make an application to the federal agency. The federal agency has to take that seriously, and they've got to look at the pros and cons of that and the consequences.

So the question is, this document is a big what-if question, that's all it is. Essentially what this says is what would happen if we did something like this. What are the consequences, what are the options. Not all the answers --

LYNDA YOUNCE: So if we don't get pissed off enough, if we don't scream and protect our rights, what happens to us?

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: I also want to

```
1
     mention that the law requires you to be involved in
 2
     this, which is good. It's important that you're
 3
     involved in this process. But it's not a popularity
 4
     contest. It's not just a matter of, well, this
 5
     number of people think it's a good idea and this
 6
     number of people think it's a bad idea. Fortunately
 7
     the law is more complicated than that. But what you
 8
     have to say and the questions that you're raising
 9
     here are valid questions, no doubt about it.
               ED UEHLING: Answer them.
10
11
               FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: And they have to be
12
     answered in this thing.
1.3
               ED UEHLING: Answer them now.
14
               FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Some of those
15
     answers can't be answered here.
16
               ED UEHLING: Okay, fine. Answer the ones
17
     that you can answer.
18
               FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Let's start with
19
     the first one. What's your first question?
20
               ED UEHLING: Okay. What are the reductions
21
     in flows in the Colorado River that they're talking
2.2
     about?
23
               FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: What are the
24
     reductions of flows in the Colorado River?
25
               ED UEHLING: Yeah.
                                   This first page, the
```

whole basis of the project is a lie, okay. What are the reductions in flows?

1.3

2.2

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: How many of you believe that there have been reductions in flows in the Colorado River?

PHIL ANDERSON: There's been several periods of reduction in flows in the Colorado River.

ED UEHLING: It goes up and down.

PHIL ANDERSON: It goes up and down and that's true whenever moisture is involved.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: But the fact of the matter, I think most of you would agree, there are more straws in the aquifer, more people taking water out of that river on a regular basis. We're going into a period where a lot of scientists, not everybody agrees, but an awful lot of scientists say that we're going into a period of an extended drought where there's going to be less water available out of that river. You don't have to believe that, but generally speaking most scientists believe that that is indeed the case. Las Vegas believes that they're going to grow and they don't have enough water to sustain what they think is going to happen in the future.

PHIL ANDERSON: To take your example, if you

put too many straws in this aquifer here, we're going to be in the same situation.

2.2

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Absolutely right. The fact is we're not here to debate this. This is not the time to debate it because the agency isn't here defending itself.

first moved here, I was involved with the chamber and we got a piece of paper that said that this valley can only grow to this extent, 2,000 some odd people.

Okay, that's not very much. We're very dependent on the water here. Every little community all the way up the state is the same as we are.

Now let me ask you this question: Who becomes more valid as a citizen of the United States and a citizen of the state and of each county, the one down there that has three million or we? Whose voice seems to be louder in this condition? That's a question I don't like.

BEVAN LISTER: I know the answer to that one.

LYNDA YOUNCE: That's a question I have a problem with.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Let me try to address it. That's a valid question. And we've

heard that asked a number of different ways for the past two weeks. But the fact of the matter is that Nevada state law gives the authority to the Nevada State Engineer to decide for the most part who gets water where and where that water goes.

2.2

LYNDA YOUNCE: How do I find out about the Nevada engineer? I want to know who he is.

out about that? There's a series of public meetings -- a series of public hearings are coming up on this issue that are going to determine where the groundwater and how much groundwater can actually be taken starting in September and running through November in Carson City, and I would strongly urge you to be involved in that.

ED UEHLING: They're not going to be down in this area?

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: No, they're in Carson City. Unfortunately they're in Carson City. That's where that decision is going to be made, but there's a public process and there's going to be a variety of meetings and hearings.

PENNY WOODS: It's described on page six in the newsletter.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Yes, it's in the

newsletter and it's also in the back of that Q and A here.

2.2

JOHN SANDERS: It almost seems like we're getting the cart before the horse, because as of yet the state water engineer hasn't given them a drop, so why are we even talking about this now? Until water has been allocated, we shouldn't even be talking about a pipeline. And the allocation of that water probably isn't going to happen for years and years and years, which takes me back to Mrs. Hughes' comment of all this stuff we're putting together will be so outdated by the time that happens.

PENNY WOODS: March of 2012 the decision will be made.

ED UEHLING: Which decision?

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: The state water engineer is scheduled to make the decision in March 2001.

PENNY WOODS: Bevan suggested that I go over the EIS process with you all, and so I thought I'd quickly do that. And I don't know who was here in 2005 when the original scoping on this project was heard, but there were a series of meetings, and I believe there was one here in Alamo that asked for everybody's input on what we should look at when we

wrote this document.

2.2

And you all answered, and you came to our meetings and you submitted testimony to our court reporter at that time, or our note taker, I think we had both at different meetings. And it's in one, on the disk in chapter one and two of a listing of what you told us very, very, very summarized. But the scoping report is on our website. And if you all haven't looked at our website, I would suggest that you look at the wealth of information.

And Kim Dow, our very talented person in our office, has studiously put information on that so that everybody can understand all the aspects of this project. And we track the water rights process alongside it. And as you know, they're intricately involved with each other, but they are separate, and that's the problem is that you all are so angry about the water.

And BLM, we're talking about a pipeline.

We're talking about this line here. And we

understand that we need to disclose to you what the

impacts of the taking of the water, and we have tried

to do that, and that was one of the things we heard

from you all is we need some way to understand what

the affects of this water, the taking of this water.

And so we have several alternatives, seven, and the seven alternatives look at different ways that the water engineer could go. One is give SNWA everything they've asked for. You know, that's the one that SNWA came in with their proposal.

Everything they've asked for.

2.2

And then, you know, we kind of think that the state engineer isn't going to do that, you know. And Kimberly is back there just kind of looking at her foot, you know. But so we have, you know, the state engineer, you know, there was this back and forth with the state engineer, and the State, the Senator, the Supreme Court. But he originally granted some water rights in this area and in Spring Valley.

And so we took what he said before and we analyzed that. And then we analyzed where we thought maybe he would, you know, he would authorize some wells that were kind of disbursed across the valley but SNWA's applications have specific points of diversion. Now we kind of don't think SNWA really wants to pump there, and they'll eventually go back to the state engineer and ask for more wells.

But for now, you know -- so that was another alternative. We did an alternative where you've

```
1
     heard us talk about the Lincoln County Conservation
 2
     Recreation and Development Act. That, you know, was
 3
              It is something that we must uphold. It's a
 4
     law and it was passed by our own Congress.
 5
               FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Can you explain
 6
     what that says.
 7
               PENNY WOODS: It does tell us, it says BLM
 8
     grants a right-of-way to SNWA in this corridor, and
 9
     it was I believe this line, up to the Lincoln County
     line.
10
11
               LYNDA YOUNCE: Did we, the people, get any
12
     discussion with BLM or anybody in that process?
               PENNY WOODS: It doesn't have --
1.3
14
               FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: This is
15
     something -- this was something --
16
               WADE POULSEN: We did not have much say.
               FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: This was something
17
18
     that was passed by Congress.
19
               LYNDA YOUNCE: I think that's where my fear
20
     is coming from. This is where I'm coming from.
21
     People above me are now running my life and telling
2.2
     me what I have to do.
23
               KIM DOW: I hear you. I hear you.
                                                    I just
24
     wanted to respond that you asked if BLM offered any
25
     comments.
```

LYNDA YOUNCE: That's where my fear is coming from.

1.3

2.2

PENNY WOODS: Well, you know, we also didn't see that one coming, and not the people on the ground, you know, maybe some people in Washington did.

So we got this law and it basically says do it. And so -- where was I going with this -- oh, so we have an alternative that goes up to, you know, basically implements that law and that law only.

And then we have another one. We know that SNWA previously got water rights in Spring Valley, so we have an alternative that just says Spring Valley and Delamar, Dry and Cave, which is the valleys down here in Lincoln County, and so we have that one.

And I think I've probably covered them all.

So, you know, we took the scoping. We implemented and considered and it took quite a while to really take everything that we heard and put it into this document. And, you know, we've been listening or really trying to listen to folks. And I myself have gone out and talked to a lot of folks and even, you know, we had a scoping period of like seven months in 2005. And when we didn't, you know, when it was taking us a while, you know, we were kind of working

out different strategies with other agencies and state and local governments, we continued to get information from the public and from other agencies.

We continued to add that into the document.

1.3

2.2

So we've got what we've got. And we know it's got a few warts and a few holes, there's a few mistakes. And you've all asked some really good questions. I think, you know, we need to take that information and build on this. And I know that there's a real concern because not everything is known about this project. Even SNWA doesn't know everything about this project.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: What don't you know?

PENNY WOODS: So what we don't know is exactly where the wells are going to be. You know, what we were actually considering is this tube, or as the Great Basin Water Network likes to call it, the straw.

BEVAN LISTER: Penny, I understand you say that but if you will go and look at the monitor sites that you approved and those wells that are drilled, those are production wells, those are not monitoring wells. Guaranteed. I'm a licensed well driller.

Those are production wells.

```
1
               PENNY WOODS:
                            Did they come in with water?
 2
               BEVAN LISTER: We had this discussion up in
 3
     Pioche.
              All of that information is, what's the word,
 4
     proprietary information.
 5
               PHIL ANDERSON: A lot of them were drilled
 6
     on Delamar Valley cattle permits, and I saw them test
 7
     pumping all of them, full pipes of water shooting out
 8
     20 feet, so they came in.
 9
               FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: This is the
10
     proponent drilling these wells?
11
               BEVAN LISTER: Yes. Monitoring wells under
12
     a permit.
1.3
               PENNY WOODS:
                             Or test wells?
14
               BEVAN LISTER: Well, no --
15
                               They're monitoring wells.
               PHIL ANDERSON:
16
               BEVAN LISTER: -- because as a monitor or an
17
     exploration well they don't have to file logs with
18
     the State of Nevada so it maintains the propriety of
19
     the information. Only -- I don't know, did you find
20
     out if you had information or not?
21
               WADE POULSEN: Yes, I do.
2.2
               BEVAN LISTER: Good deal. But that
23
     information is not available like on the state
24
     engineer's website or those kind of things because
25
     those wells were not logged.
```

```
1
               FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Could I ask, does
 2
     BLM have any authority over that?
 3
               PENNY WOODS: Well, we granted the
 4
     right-of-ways.
 5
               FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Just the
 6
     right-of-way.
 7
               PENNY WOODS: The Ely district.
 8
               WADE POULSEN: State engineer controls how
 9
     it's drilled, where it's drilled and how much.
10
     it's done a pump test on it and all that other kind
11
     of stuff, look at the state engineer.
12
               PENNY WOODS: But did we get that data into
     the model?
1.3
14
               WADE POULSEN: Yes, we did.
15
               PENNY WOODS: So the data is in the model.
16
     You might actually be able to find it in the reports.
               FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: So the information
17
18
     is used in this?
19
               PENNY WOODS: Yeah.
20
               WADE POULSEN: The information was
21
     available --
2.2
               FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: What you've got
23
     now.
24
               WADE POULSEN: What information we were able
25
     to use for the model, for the gentleman who said that
```

```
SNWA did the model, no, we did the model under
 1
 2
     direction from SNWA.
 3
               PHIL ANDERSON: Bought and paid for it?
 4
     Bought and paid for all we need to do --
 5
               WADE POULSEN: And I get it right.
 6
               FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC:
                                        They paid for it
 7
     but this is something that's peer reviewed by a lot
 8
     of independent people.
 9
               WADE POULSEN: Right. We, the BLM --
10
               JOHN SANDERS:
                              I quarantee you'll have some
11
     peers show up in Carson City disputing everything you
12
     said.
13
               WADE POULSEN: That's the nature of models.
14
               JOHN SANDERS: It is the nature of models,
15
     it's the nature of what we're doing; however, I would
16
     like to say that along with these monitoring wells,
17
     the state statute says monitoring wells can only be
18
     three inches.
                    These are 21 inches.
19
               BEVAN LISTER: Unless they have a waiver.
20
               JOHN SANDERS: Unless they granted a waiver.
21
     The waiver was not granted when they drilled the
2.2
     wells. The question wasn't asked until a public
23
     meeting after the wells were in the ground by Mike
24
     Davis up there, and then they said, We didn't even
25
     know about that in the meeting, and then magically
```

everything appeared.

2.2

PENNY WOODS: Then you got waivers.

JOHN SANDERS: But here's my question: To grant that right-of-way for them to drill those monitoring wells that were actually preproduction wells, the BLM advocated their responsibility by granting those right-of-ways because they were not in legal compliance with state law.

We are going through a little pipeline on irrigation water that we own that goes across a small stretch of BLM land, we're five and a half years into it, not nearly as far along as these guys are with this huge project. We're not going to disturb anything, it's our water and it's between two pieces of private property. Everything is in compliance, and every step of the way the BLM is questioning us, Are we in legal compliance with the state water engineer and making us provide a letter from the state water engineer every step of the way. That obviously did not happen. The BLM advocated that responsibility when those wells went in without a waiver and without you checking on them.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Hang on a minute, that's a charge. Hang on guys.

JOHN SANDERS: The state engineer let them

```
1
     have it. Let them have it.
 2
               FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Do you think that's
 3
     the case, BLM advocated responsibility on that?
               JOHN SANDERS: Well, you don't even know how
 4
     big the well is. You don't even know if there's any
 5
 6
     water in it.
 7
               FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: What was BLM's
 8
     authority over it?
 9
               JOHN SANDERS: The right-of-way to drill it.
10
               PENNY WOODS: It's FLPMA.
               JOHN SANDERS: It was a NEPA process.
11
12
               PENNY WOODS: Yeah.
13
               JOHN SANDERS: There should have been an EIS
14
     on the right-of-way.
15
               PENNY WOODS:
                             Right.
16
               BEVAN LISTER: Because it's an exploration.
17
               JOHN SANDERS: It doesn't necessarily have
18
     to be an EIS, it could be an EA, it could be in a CX.
19
               PENNY WOODS: It would have been an EA. Ely
20
     district did that.
21
               JOHN SANDERS: They're the ones holding us
2.2
          Somebody has standing, somebody doesn't.
     up.
23
               PENNY WOODS: Did I get to the end of my
24
     piece?
25
               BEVAN LISTER: I don't know.
                                             What Penny was
```

trying to say is that scoping five years ago kind of set the ground floor on what questions they were going to address in the EIS process. And then they gathered science and dealt with other agencies and things in the process, and so they've come out with a draft document of basically the science, for what it's worth, but really to address the questions raised in scoping.

1.3

2.2

And so now they have these sets of hearings to hear other questions, to hear comments on what they have compiled and then they'll go back and supposedly answer those questions, look at those issues that have been raised and then it comes back as a final EIS and then you get to comment on it again. That's kind of how the process works.

It's really elongated here because we've got six years in this part of it. I imagine we'll be at least a year in redoing the final and so we're going to be out here some more time but that's how the process works. For us, most importantly, and what NEPA allows us to comment on and what forces the BLM to recognize is affects to the environment and the custom, culture and economy of the area.

So if you have questions, if you have concerns and comments, focus on those areas: Custom,

culture, economy and environment. And, I mean, yeah, we can argue the water part of it but it's a moot point with the BLM. That's a whole other venue with the state engineer but the basis for what we can do is in those areas.

1.3

2.2

And I think the economic questions, there's no way, they can't project. You can't even try to model what the economic impacts to this county or White Pine County a hundred years down the road might be if a project like this goes through. You simply can't do it.

 $\label{eq:facilitator} \mbox{FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC:} \quad \mbox{You did a pretty} \\ \mbox{nice summary on this I think.}$

BEVAN LISTER: Sorry.

summed it up really well. But there's one other thing that I want to point out though. I think there's an awful lot of implication here that somehow BLM sort of thinks this is a great idea and there's no problems with this. But if you take the time to read through just this executive summary, you're going to see an awful lot of data I think that clearly points out consequences to this. BLM isn't saying this is a good idea or a bad idea, its job is to look at this very, very objectively. It's a

```
1
     what-if answer. And I think an awful lot of things
 2
     have been pointed out in this.
 3
               BEVAN LISTER: And I agree with that.
 4
     the premise that most of the information and
 5
     conclusions that you brought out, no argument with,
                                           It's all a moot
 6
     my problem is is it doesn't matter.
 7
     point because it's a done deal. So, I mean, I
 8
     understand how all this process works, but Harry Reid
 9
     already bypassed the process.
10
               FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Well, that may be
11
     above our collective pay grades.
12
               Yes, sir, you had a question?
13
               RAY SCHMUTZ: What was the time scope
14
     considered in doing this EIS? Ray Schmutz,
15
     S-c-h-m-u-t-z.
16
               FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: What's your
17
     address?
18
               RAY SCHMUTZ: HCR 61 Box 75, Hiko, Nevada
19
     89017.
20
                             Time scope of the EIS?
               PENNY WOODS:
21
               RAY SCHMUTZ:
                             Yes.
2.2
               FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: No, time scope of
23
     what this looks at, the consequence.
24
               RAY SCHMUTZ: Yeah, what are you looking at
25
     when you got --
```

1 FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: This goes out like 2 a year, two years. 3 PENNY WOODS: Okay, so we looked at full 4 build-out, which we define as when they -- if this was approved, when all the pipeline was built, so all 5 6 the pipeline is in, oh, this one, all the way to 7 Snake Valley, and so it's about 2050. 8 FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: 2050. 9 PENNY WOODS: So that's the first time scope 10 then we added 75 years to that. 11 FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: 2125. 12 PENNY WOODS: And then we added 200 years, 1.3 so another 125 years. So this 14 FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Right. 15 thing looked at the short-term and the really 16 long-term consequences of this. 17 RAY SCHMUTZ: At the long-term consequences 18 considered in the overall analysis? 19 FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Part of it. 20 PENNY WOODS: So, you know, Kim just 21 whispered to me that I should mention the 2.2 programmatic part of the EIS, and we did, you know, 23 the pipeline itself, just, you know, this here is 24 what we analyzed in detail. So all the impacts of 25 building a pipeline, putting it in the ground, the

white sage issues, the, you know, subsidence from building that large of a pipeline, those sorts of things, the things that you all have dealt with when putting pipelines on your ranches, okay.

1.3

2.2

Then there was this programmatic scope of this, which was this overarching, what is the affects of the water, you know, when you draw that much water out of an underground aquifer, what happens. And so we analyzed that. That's the programmatic part.

There's also future facilities that we don't quite know where they're at. You know, the wells, where are they? We need little pumps.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Where would they be.

PENNY WOODS: Yeah, they need little pumps, they need power, they need roads to them, they need little pipelines to them.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: And before any of those can be done, what has to happen?

PENNY WOODS: We need another EIS. You know, everybody is going to have multiple chances at looking at this over and over again. You're going to get sick of this.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Before it goes into any of those details, we'd be back here. BLM would

have to be back here.

2.2

PENNY WOODS: Yeah. So one thing I did want to get back to was the Lincoln County Conservation Recreation Act. And Bevan has asked us a couple of times, you know, it's a done deal, all that. And so, you know, I do say that that law does require that we grant this, but it does not say how. And so we have included in the EIS a number of mitigation measures. I think it gets to your concerns about how is it going to be done. And we called for a number of plans and reports to be written before, you know, one teaspoon of dirt ever comes off the desert.

And so I would really like a good, thorough review of those mitigation measures and maybe suggestions for new ones, because that's going to be the key to this. It's not, you know, if we do or if we don't, it's how.

ED UEHLING: No one has answered the question as to why an armed guard has to be here.

I'd be interested in that. And also there was a pipeline -- there was, I think there was a pipeline built from Coyote Springs that the water district brought water.

WADE POULSEN: I can answer that question.

ED UEHLING: So it's true, okay. So does

that pipeline go through BLM land? Was that pipeline approved by BLM? And what's the deal with that now that Las Vegas doesn't need water?

1.3

2.2

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: One at a time.

WADE POULSEN: The answer to your question, there is a pipeline, a 30-inch pipeline that goes from Coyote Springs basin, water basin, to the Bowman reservoir in Moapa, and that is water rights that were given to the Coyote Springs investment that were in the basin in Coyote Springs. The state engineer granted them the opportunity to pump that water, to do pump testing. You have to pump test your wells to see if your basin can sustain the pumping.

They were given the amount of time to pump it. It cost them about \$30 million to build that pipeline down to the Bowman reservoir. They pumped that water specifically to see what the water table in Coyote Springs water basin will do. They released it into the Bowman reservoir, which now goes through Moapa irrigation system and then ends up in Lake Mead.

Southern Nevada Water Authority has done this. They get return credits that they can pull out of Lake Mead because that water is going into it so they can pull the water out. That is a period of

```
1
     time pumping.
                    I don't know the exact time.
 2
     believe it's a year or maybe two years that they can
 3
     pump that, and then they receive data from the
 4
     pumping of that well as to what the water table is.
     They started pumping last fall, this last fall.
 5
 6
     Early winter is when they actually started to pump
 7
     that water.
                  It took them a year or so to get the
 8
     pipeline built.
 9
               ED UEHLING: When I've driven up here
10
     before, one of Pahranagat lakes was looked like it
11
     was dry or was empty, and when I drove today it
     looked like it was full. Does this pipeline have
12
     anything to do with that?
13
14
               LAURELLE HUGHES:
                                 No, it was actually the
15
     one reservoir, they had some problems with the dam
16
     and they had to empty it of water to do some work on
17
     the dam, so the water went on down wherever it goes.
18
               ED UEHLING: But not to Coyote Spring?
19
     for this pipeline?
20
               LAURELLE HUGHES:
                                 No.
21
               VICTORIA BARR: The refuge gets the water
2.2
     sometimes. Victoria Barr, field manager, Caliente,
23
     for Bureau of Land Management.
24
               FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC:
                                        For BLM.
25
               VICTORIA BARR: It's shared use of water for
```

the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Pahranagat, the National Wildlife Refuge and then local uses of that water for agricultural purpose.

1.3

2.2

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Does that satisfy?

Does that answer your question?

ED UEHLING: Yeah, there's more important questions than that one. What about this armed quard?

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: I'll tell you what,

I made the request. I do public meetings for a

living. I mean, that's what I do, I facilitate

public meetings. I've been doing this for 20 or

25 years now. The fact of the matter is that we live

in a new world. And most of the time when we deal

with controversial issues, it's just really helpful

to have somebody there to make sure that nobody gets

hurt.

Do you think crazy things go on in public meetings? Have you seen evidence of that? Did anybody read the newspaper, watch television, see these things go on? It's a tough issue. There are a lot of people here that are damn pissed about this on one side or the other. And when you get groups of people like that together, bad things can happen. So I made the request of BLM and said that I think it

And

1 would be appropriate to have somebody there just 2 managing security. So you can pin it on me and I'm 3 sorry. 4 PENNY WOODS: I do apologize. You know, 5 it's not any particular group. And you guys have 6 been great. You know, you've been very well behaved, 7 so thank you. 8 FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: And we didn't pick 9 and choose the meetings to do this. I just said, 10 We're going to have all these meetings, we should 11 probably have somebody there, not jackbooted thugs 12 running around the building but somebody there just 1.3 to make sure somebody doesn't get hurt, that's all. 14 BEVAN LISTER: And the reason I bring the 15 issue up is because we have local law enforcement --16 FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Absolutely. 17 BEVAN LISTER: -- that have legal 18 jurisdiction that could arrest somebody. He can't. 19 Sorry, he has no authority. 20 FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Valid point. 21 BEVAN LISTER: And his exercising authority 2.2 on someone would create far more controversy in this 23 group than you will just saying, hey, we need to settle down. 24

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: I understand.

1 that's where it usually starts and that's usually all 2 it really takes. I mean, reasonable people do 3 reasonable things. 4 BEVAN LISTER: He is more likely to insight 5 problems in this setting. 6 FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Well, you notice 7 he's also outside. 8 BEVAN LISTER: Well, he is tonight because 9 there was no room but in Pioche he was sitting right 10 there. And I'm sorry but, like I said, it's more --11 that situation is more likely to insight a problem 12 than it is to settle a problem. 13 FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Valid point. 14 BEVAN LISTER: If you want to settle the 15 problem, I know the county sheriff, I've got his cell 16 phone in my address book, he would have been more 17 than happy to be here or send a deputy. Him and I 18 discussed it and it's a simple thing just to say, 19 hey, we're having a meeting, would you send somebody 20 down. 21 FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Valid point. 2.2 stand chastised. 23 What else? 24 LYNDA YOUNCE: Are you going to be having 25 more of these meetings to keep us informed?

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Are we going to be having more of these meetings? You know, you raise a good point, because what happens from here --

1.3

2.2

PENNY WOODS: Let me tell you, you know, the Baker people don't have any problem calling me up on the phone and say, Penny, we need you to come out and give us an update. You know, you guys can do the same, I will be out here, you know, any time and we'll sit down and we'll go over what the latest is, what I know, you know.

I would invite you to stay tuned to our website. But, you know, my number is all over that website. Kim's number is on it. You know, you can get a hold of us. I've got cards somewhere.

KIM DOW: For those of you on the mailing list, we started publishing a newsletter at the very beginning that just talked about the very basics of the project. We're on newsletter number eight now, which is the one being handed out here. Each one just adds to the next one, so when someone new comes to the mailing list, they get all of the past ones. Realizing that some of the information has changed over the years so the first may not have all the accurate information anymore but at least we have the whole history.

1 And those newsletters are used to update 2 everyone on what's going on, or most of the topics in 3 the newsletters come from the people when they see 4 the newsletter, they email me and ask questions or 5 have topics that they want us to address. That's 6 where I'd say 90 percent of the topics that we cover 7 come from is people who have been asking us 8 So if you're on our mailing list, you'll questions. 9 be getting those newsletters. PENNY WOODS: So feel free to call me and we 10 11 can, you know, sit down and talk about what's going 12 on, you know, at that point in time. 13 FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: You'll come back 14 out here? 15 PENNY WOODS: And I'll come back, yeah. 16 FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: And if you'd like 17 to pull a group of people together to meet with like 18 this, that would be fine, right? 19 PENNY WOODS: Yeah, so I'm more than willing 20 to do that. 21

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: What else? You know, if anybody has got something that they would like to put on the formal public record, and you'd prefer to do it privately rather than publicly, Debbie is going to be here for a bit. Please feel

2.2

23

24

```
1
     free to sit down with her. If you've got individual
 2
     questions, these folks are going to be back over here
 3
     for a while yet as well. Thanks for coming. It's a
 4
     tough one.
 5
                     (Thereupon the proceedings
 6
                     were concluded at 7:19 p.m.)
7
 8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	STATE OF NEVADA)
3	SS:
4	COUNTY OF NYE)
5	I, Deborah Ann Hines, certified court
6	reporter, do hereby certify that I took down in
7	shorthand (Stenotype) all of the proceedings had in
8	the before-entitled matter at the time and place
9	indicated; and that thereafter said shorthand notes
10	were transcribed into typewriting at and under my
11	direction and supervision and the foregoing
12	transcript constitutes a full, true and accurate
13	record of the proceedings had.
14	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto affixed
15	my hand this 14th day of September, 2011.
16	
17	
18	
19	Deborah Ann Hines, CCR #473, RPR
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	